

to offer a multiple function mode device that may be reconfigurable based on selecting modes of operation with out reinitializing the device.

Applicant further submits that SAWANO, KAWADE or Lian alone nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests make obvious the invention recited in the Claims because the cited references do not disclose a two part boot algorithm. The present invention claims a two part boot algorithm, the first boot algorithm may be common to the various functional modes to be executed. The second boot algorithm is dependent on the functional mode to be executed.

The applicant respectfully traverses the examiner assertion that Claim 3, 4 and 8 are obvious. The examiner merely states that “would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.” The applicant respectfully submits that the mere fact that the prior art could be modified does not make that modification obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modifications. As such the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner identify how the prior art suggests the desirability of the modifications.

Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection based on SAWANO, KAWADE and LIAN is not proper. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection to allow Claim 2, 3, 4, 8, 15, 16, and 21.

The applicant respectfully traverses the motivation that the examiner has provided in combining the various cited 103 prior art references. The examiner merely states that the motivation is in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The applicant respectfully submits that the mere fact that the prior art could be modified does not make that modification obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the modifications. As such the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner identify how the prior art suggests the desirability of the modifications.

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant’s present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed April 17, 2006. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-26.

An extension of three (3) months is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 with the appropriate fee attached. While Applicants believe no further fee is due with this transmission, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1415 of SigmaTel, Inc.

While Applicants believe no fee is due with this transmission, if any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1415 of SigmaTel, Inc

Respectfully submitted,



By: _____

Robert A. McLauchlan
Reg. No. 44,924

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Dated: October 16, 2006

Garlick Harrison Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(512) 228-3611
(512) 857-0563 (Fax)